

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 11-15, 18, 42, 42, 50-56, 59, 60, 63, 64, and 66-68 are pending. Claim 62 was previously canceled and is again indicated as canceled herein. All independent claims (1, 18, 42, 59, 63, 64, 66-68) have been amended.

Claim Objection

The Examiner objected to claim 62 because this claim was not listed. Claim 62 is currently listed and is canceled, thereby rendering this objection moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejected claims 66-68 because allegedly the claimed invention was directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant disagrees, but has amended each of these claims as follows: “A computer readable storage medium comprising a computer program ~~configured to operate on a computer readable storage medium~~, that when executed controls a processor to perform”. It is believed that a “computer readable storage medium” falls into the class of an article of manufacture and therefore the amended claims 66-68 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicant requests the §101 rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 15, 18, 42, 43, 54-56, 59, 60, 62-64, and 66-68 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta (U.S. Patent no. 6,389,532) in view of Mitreuter (U.S. Patent Publication no. 2003/033375). Applicant has amended independent claim 1 in the following manner: “the validity information further comprising public key information of a sending node comprising ~~one of the public key of the sending node or~~ an identity of an entity from which the public key of the sending node can be obtained”. This amendment is also made to independent claims 18, 42, 59, 63, 64, 66-68.

The Examiner asserts that “the validity information further comprising public key information of a sending node comprising … the public key of the sending node” is not disclosed by Gupta, but that Mitreuter, U.S. Patent Publication no. 2003/0033375 discloses this subject matter. What Mitreuter states is the following (emphasis added):

[0037] The Internet Service Provider subsequently derives a digital signature from the modified IP packets including the reference data sent by the user, in order to secure the identification data and the reference data sent by the user from falsification (data integrity). The modified IP packet is used to calculate a checksum, which is coded with the secret key of the Internet Service Provider (Integrity Check Value). Finally, the Internet Service Provider adds to the IP packet header his electronic certificate (ISP X.509 Certificate), which contains the ISP's public key for decoding the checksum. Thereby, each recipient of the IP message can verify the correctness of the digital signature by decoding the checksum and comparing it to the checksum the recipient has calculated. In addition to that, the recipient has the option to obtain further data on the Internet user (name, address) from the certificate holder (the Internet Service Provider) named in the certificate. (This could be used for Malicious Caller Identification.)

However, there is no disclosure or implication in either Gupta or Mitreuter of at least the subject matter of “the validity information further comprising public key information of a sending node comprising an identity of an entity from which the public key of the sending node can be obtained”. Thus, the combination of Gupta and Mitreuter does not disclose this subject matter and independent claims 1, 18, 42, 59, 63, 64, 66-68 are patentable over the combination of Gupta and Mitreuter.

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 12-14, and 51-53 over Gupta in view of Mitreuter and in further view of Naudus (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,081).

Because independent claims 1, 18, 42, and 59 are patentable, their dependent claims 2, 4, 11-15, 43, 50-54, and 60 are patentable for at least the same reasons.



S.N. 10/721,504
Art Unit: 2431

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing arguments, it should be apparent that all remaining claims are thus allowable over the reference(s) cited by the Examiner, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney for any issues.

Respectfully submitted:

Robert J. Mauri
Reg. No.: 41,180

8 MARCH 2010

Date

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, Attorneys at Law, LLC
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400
Facsimile: (203)944-0245
email: rmauri@hspatent.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 or is being transmitted electronically to the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Clarie F. Mauri
Name of Person Making Deposit

3/8/2010
Date